

Serial No. 09/764,911

-2-

PA 000002

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 5-7, 9-13, 19-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Okano "Analysis of resolution limit of Integral Photography" in view of Arai et al., JP 1-227995, Woodgate 6377295, Zeiss DE 29612054U, and Sugihara et al IEICE.

In relation to independent claim 20, the office action states Okano shows a 3-D display apparatus, an image capture unit a set of light detecting elements responsive to light from said object to provide an image signal representing said object, an image capture array arranged to pass light from said object to the detecting elements spaced from said set of image detecting element by a first distance. The office action states Figure 2 of Okano shows the system.

The office action states Okano further shows a display with pixels corresponding to said set of light responsive detecting elements and responsive to said image signal to pass light from said light source there-through.

Applicant will discuss each of the above features in turn. First, the cited figure 2 of Okano might be said, arguendo, to show either a display apparatus or an image capture apparatus. However, Okano cannot be said to illustrate both an image capture apparatus and a display apparatus as recited in applicant's claim 20 as two separate features.

The image capture apparatus of applicant's claim 20 includes, *inter alia*, "a set of light responsive detecting elements". One example(CCDa 12) of light responsive detecting elements is described in applicant's specification and illustrated in applicant's Fig. 1. CCD's are a typical example of elements "responsive to light to provide an image signal representing said object". An image signal is understood in the art to mean an electrical signal that is produced by converting incident light to current. Okano lacks any disclosure or suggestion of such a light responsive detecting element. Further, assuming arguendo Okano discloses

Serial No. 09/764,911

-3-

EA 000002

an image capture array, for example in cited Okano Figure 2 "aperture exit pupil", Okano would still lack a disclosure of "an image capture array spaced from said set of image detecting elements by a first distance" as featured in applicant's claim 20.

Even assuming, arguendo Okano Fig. 2 shows an image capture array spaced from a set of image detecting elements by a first distance, Okano would still lack any disclosure of any element to correspond to applicant's claimed display unit. Further, Okano does not show a display unit including a light source. Further Okano does not show a display unit including a light source and a set of light transmissive pixels. Okano further lacks any disclosure of an image display array "corresponding to said image capture array and arranged to pass there-through light passed through light transmissive pixels."

Because Okano lacks disclosure of significant elements of applicant's claim 20 applicant believes independent claim 20 is allowable as entered. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allowance of the claims.

Applicant believes a telephone interview might help to clarify the issues raised in the office action and invites the Examiner to call the undersigned at the examiner's convenience if the examiner agrees a telephone interview would clarify any issues raised herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 27, 2006



Christine Johnson
Registration No. 38,507
609-734-6892

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing, Inc.
P. O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312